



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/862,542	05/22/2001	Robert Alan Reeves	STEV-109	1268

7590 12/01/2003
ROBERT E. STRAUSS
74527 Moss Rose Drive
Palm Desert, CA 92260

EXAMINER

CHANG, VICTOR S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/862,542

Applicant(s)

REEVES ET AL.

Examiner

Victor S Chang

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 6-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6-8 and 16-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet, 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet, 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s), _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Examiner has carefully considered Applicants' amendment and remarks filed on 11/17/2003. Applicants' amendments to claims 1 has been entered. However, it should be noted that the parenthetical expressions following the claim numbers are not compliant with the revised amendment practice 37 CFR 1.121. For example, in claim 1, the expression "(fourth amendment)" should be changed to --(currently amended)--; and in claim 2, the expression "(previously amended)" should be changed to --(previously presented)--. Appropriate correction is required.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Rejections not maintained are withdrawn. In particular, Applicants' arguments that "The ... wax used in the indicia coat is disclosed to have a melting temperature from 90 to 300 degrees F" (Remarks, page 6, first full paragraph) and "the transfer is applied to the mold surface at demolding temperature, which is typically from 90 degrees to 170 degrees" (Remarks, page 6, bottom paragraph) appear persuasive. As such, the prior rejection of claims 1-2, 6-8 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is withdrawn.

Response to Amendment

4. Claims 1-2, 6-8 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Markar et al. (US

5908694), substantially for the reasons set forth in section 4 of Paper No. 12, together with the following additional observations.

Although the "new matter" rejection of claims 1-2, 6-8 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is withdrawn based on Applicants' further clarification, as set forth above, nevertheless, the Examiner would like to remind Applicants that in Paper No. 0922, section 7, the Examiner has indicated that when ^{and if} the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is overcome ~~by withdrawn~~, the prior rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Markar et al. (US 5908694) must be re-inserted. The Examiner apologizes for not explicitly indicating that the rejection would also be re-inserted if the rejected is overcome by argument and clarification as well, especially it is noted that Applicants' clarification clearly renders Noguchi's reference regarding the use of wax in ink pertinent. As such, the Examiner repeats the prior observation in section 7 of Paper No. 0922 regarding Applicants' Remarks filed 7/24/2003 as follows, and no new grounds of rejection has been introduced.

With respect to Applicants' argument that "none skilled in the art would obviously expose a transfer having an adhesive layer containing up to 30% nitrocellulose to rotational molding temperature as that layer would not be stable under such temperature" (Remarks, page 7, first full paragraph), the Examiner notes that Markar expressly teaches that during the manufacturing the deposited layer is heated, causing the volatile component of the ink composition to evaporate and leaving only the non-volatile component to form layer 125. Further, it should be noted that such an assertion of what seems to follow from common experience is just an unsupported argument and

not the kind of factual evidence that is required to rebut a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2145.I.

With respect to Applicants' argument that "Since Markar et al print on a lacquer surface, there would be no purpose to substituting the Noguchi ink for the polyamide ink of Markar et al." (Remarks, page 7, second full paragraph), the Examiner repeats (see Paper No. 12, page 3) that Noguchi's invention is directed to an ink for heat transfer, and Noguchi teaches that it is known art that in order to prevent running and strike-through of the ink and to keep the printed image quality by adjustment of the ink formulation, a solid component like a wax and a polymeric compound is added to the ink with the dye component (column 2, lines 7-12). As such, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Markar's heat transfer label with Noguchi's ink which also prevents running at demolding temperature, motivated by the desire to prevent running of the ink under the heat transfer conditions.

With respect to Applicants' argument that Markar does not teach that "indicia as a direct, rather than mirror, image on the carrier" (Remarks, page 7, bottom paragraph), the Examiner notes that coating "indicia as a direct image" is not recited in any of the claims of the instant invention.

With respect to Applicants' argument the "the heat activated adhesive layer must be ... non-adhesive at ambient temperature, adhesive at the demolding temperature and stable at, and melt below, the molding temperature", the Examiner repeats (see Paper No. 12, page 3) that it is believed that selecting a heat-activatable adhesive layer

with suitable melting temperature is either inherently disclosed, or an obvious optimization to one of the ordinary skill in the art.

With respect to Applicants' argument that "the indicia coat must be printed with indicia material in hydrocarbon wax" (Remarks, page 8, top paragraph), the Examiner again repeats that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Markar's heat transfer label with Noguchi's ink, which contains hydrocarbon wax, motivated by the desire to prevent running of the ink under the heat transfer conditions.

For newly added claims 18 and 19, the Examiner notes that although Markar lacks an express teaching of using polyester film for carrier layer, it is believed that the use of an inherently transparent polyester film as a carrier layer for heat transfer is either inherently disclosed, or an obvious optimization to one skilled in the art of heat transfer label, motivated by the desire to obtain heat resistance under heat transfer conditions. Note also as evidence of the state of the art Hiatt et al. (US 6254970) which is directed to substrates for heat transfer labels. Hiatt teaches that it is known art that various substrates can be used as carrier layer of a heat transfer label, including polyester films, etc. (column 1, lines 30-37).

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 1771

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor S Chang whose telephone number is 703-605-4296. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel H Morris can be reached on 703-308-2414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

VSC

DANIEL ZIRKER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800
1700

Daniel Zinker